

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to amendment filed on 12/23/2008.
2. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph to claim 19 is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment.
3. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Aubury (USPUB 2003/0140337 A1), In view of Bickmore et al. (USPN 6,857,102 B1), further in view of Li et al. (USPN 7,143,392 B2), to claims 1-19 is withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment.
4. Claim 1 has been amended (see Examiner's Amendment below).
5. Claims 4-5 have been canceled (see Examiner's Amendment below).
6. Claims 1-3, and 6-18 are pending.
7. Claims 1-3, and 6-18 are allowance.

EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

8. An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Mark Joy (Reg. No. 35,562) on 2/25/2009 to place the application in condition of allowance.

The application has been amended as follows:

In the Claims:

Claims 4-5 have been canceled.

Claim 1 has been amended as below.

1. (Currently amended) A method for partitioning a specification in a source code; characterized in that the method comprises the following steps:

first converting the specification into a plurality of abstract syntax trees;

partitioning the plurality of abstract syntax trees into at least a first set and a second set of abstract syntax trees, wherein the step of partitioning comprises a step of out-lining at least one abstract syntax tree of the first set of abstract syntax trees based on profile data as input data and replacing said abstract syntax tree by a function call to a function present as an abstract syntax tree in the second set of abstract syntax trees;

implementing the first set of abstract syntax trees ~~to be implemented~~ by a first processor and implementing the second set of abstract syntax trees ~~to be implemented~~ by a second processor; and

defining an interface between the first processor and the second processor, wherein the interface comprises a remote function call, the remote function call having a set of parameters, the set of parameters comprising an identifier for the function to be called, at least one reference pointing to the input data of the function to be called, at least one reference pointing to the result data of the function to be called, and a

reference pointing to a memory location used for storing information on the return status of the function to be called; and

second converting, after the partitioning step, the first set of abstract syntax trees and the second set of abstract syntax trees back to source code, thereby facilitating editing of a resulting specification in the source code, wherein the second converting step comprises converting the first set of abstract syntax trees to a first partial specification in the source code and converting the second set of abstract syntax trees to a second partial specification in the source code.

REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

9. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

The cited prior art taken alone or in combination fail to teach, in combination with other claimed limitations, wherein the step of partitioning comprises a step of out-lining at least one abstract syntax tree of the first set of abstract syntax trees based on profile data as input data and replacing said abstract syntax tree by a function call to a function present as an abstract syntax tree in the second set of abstract syntax trees; implementing the first set of abstract syntax trees by a first processor and implementing the second set of abstract syntax trees by a second processor; defining an interface between the first processor and the second processor, wherein the interface comprises a remote function call, the remote function call having a set of parameters, the set of parameters comprising an identifier for the function to be called, at least one reference pointing to the input data of the function to be called, at least one reference pointing to

the result data of the function to be called, and a reference pointing to a memory location used for storing information on the return status of the function to be called as recited in the independent claim 1.

The cited prior art, the combination of Aubury (USPUB 2003/0140337 A1), Bickmore et al. (USPN 6,857,102 B1), and li et al. (USPN 7,143,392 B2), teaches a method for partitioning a specification in a source, however, the combination of Aubury, Bickmore, and li fails to teach wherein the step of partitioning comprises a step of outlining at least one abstract syntax tree of the first set of abstract syntax trees based on profile data as input data and replacing said abstract syntax tree by a function call to a function present as an abstract syntax tree in the second set of abstract syntax trees; implementing the first set of abstract syntax trees by a first processor and implementing the second set of abstract syntax trees by a second processor; defining an interface between the first processor and the second processor, wherein the interface comprises a remote function call, the remote function call having a set of parameters, the set of parameters comprising an identifier for the function to be called, at least one reference pointing to the input data of the function to be called, at least one reference pointing to the result data of the function to be called, and a reference pointing to a memory location used for storing information on the return status of the function to be called as recited in claim 1 and as pointed out in applicant's Remark, page 6.

These claimed limitations are not present in the prior art of record and would not have been obvious, thus all pending claims 1-3, and 6-18 are allowed.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anna Deng whose telephone number is 571-272-5989. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays to Fridays 9:30 - 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Zhen can be reached on 571-272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Anna Deng/

Examiner, Art Unit 2191

Application/Control Number: 10/522,083

Page 7

Art Unit: 2191

/Wei Y Zhen/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2191